

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

June 5, 2002

Maricopa Association of Governments Office, Cholla Room
302 North First Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

VOTING MEMBERS

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Barry Combs, Chandler | * Keith Kesti, Peoria |
| Mark Weiner, Gilbert | Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.) |
| Pat Thurman, Glendale | * Troy Hayes, Phoenix (Water) |
| * David Ramirez, Goodyear | * Rod Ramos, Scottsdale |
| Joe Phillips for Ted Collins, MCDOT | * Brian Pirooz, Surprise |
| Steven Borst, MCESD | James Bond, Tempe |
| Doug Davis, Mesa | |

ADVISORY MEMBERS

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| * James Pulice, Jr., AGC | * Tom Domizi, UTCA |
| Jim Grose, AGC | Peter Kandaris, SRP Engineering |
| Paul Nebeker, UTCA | * Sean Goris, ACEA |
| Jeff Benedict, ARPA | |

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Paul Ward

GUESTS/VISITORS

John Ashley, Arizona Cement Association
Dale Phelan, Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.
Mark Kastl, Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:38 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the minutes from the meeting of May 1, 2002. Jeff Van Skike introduced a motion for a vote on the minutes as written. Joe Phillips seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. 2001 Carry Over Cases:

- a. **Case 01-07 - Sections 750 & 630 - Various Water Changes:** Rod Ramos was not present to address the progress of this case. Doug Davis asked if any members had access to the latest AWWA specification for the larger sizes of resilient-seated gate valves. Jim Grose would check to see if he could obtain a copy.
- b. **Case 01-08 - Section 710 - Pavement Replacement:** Rod Ramos was not present to address the progress in the case and the members had no comments.

4. 2002 Submitted Cases:

- a. **Case 02-02 - Section 738.2 - Definition of Low Pressure Storm Drain:** Doug Davis submitted a revised wording for this case. A summary of the changes are as follows: The ASTM D-3212 is a production test and not a field test and in turn, should be placed in the materials section (738.1). The field test as specified in Section 603.1 should remain in that section. The members were requested to review the case and if no comments, the members should be prepared to vote on the case.
- b. **Case 02-03 - Section 321.6 - Corrective Requirement for Deficient Asphalt:** Joe Phillips was not able to consolidate all of the comments for the next draft on this case. He informed the committee that the draft will be ready by the mailing of the July packet.
- c. **Case 02-04 - Section 710 - Asphalt Concrete:** See meeting minutes in Case 02-03 above.
- d. **Case 02-05 - Section 711 - Paving Asphalt:** See meeting minutes in Case 02-03 above.
- e. **Case 02-06 - Miscellaneous Corrections A & B:** There was no discussion or comments regarding the two corrections in this case.
- f. **Case 02-08 - Section 345-2 - Adjusting Frames:** Jeff Van Skike submitted a revised wording for the case. The wording should clarify the difference between adjusting the manhole frame and cover versus adjusting the cover only. Barry Combs expressed an interest to permit metal adjustments rings. Jeff noted several problems the City of Phoenix had with the metal adjustments (noisy, more involved installation, split ring, etc.). Barry will discuss the case with his agency and submit modified wording if they elect to do so. Doug Davis announced that if no comments are brought forward in the next meeting, the members should be ready to vote on this case.
- g. **Case 02-09 - Detail 130 - Barricades -** Ted Collins did not provide any information to Joe Phillips regarding the case. The members had no comments. Doug Davis announced that if no comments are brought forward in the next meeting, the members should be ready to vote on this case.
- h. **Case 02-10 - Table 725-1 - Concrete Classes -** Peter Kandarlis provided a packet of information regarding the soft and hard conversions to the Metric system. The packet will better explain how the present Metric Specification was developed. There was some general discussion regarding various options to resolve the problem which included the rounding of the numbers. Doug Davis suggested that the conversions for the weight of

portland cement in each class of concrete be checked for similar problems in their conversions. Joe will review the information and return with a revised draft.

- i. **Case 02-11 - Section 340.1 - Expansion Joints** - There was a short discussion by the members on this case. The members had no clear directive or suggestions as to modifications for the case. Doug Davis requested the members continue to review the case. If the committee did not approve the 50 foot spacing, they may want to consider the revised wording.

5. New Cases:

- a. **Case 02-12 - Section 107.6.1 - Contractor's Marshaling Yard:** Doug Davis presented and discussed the rewriting of the Contractor's marshaling yard. The current wording has been interpreted by some to require the contractor to provide a copy of the agreement between the contractor and the property owner. This was not the intent when the section was rewritten several years ago. Also, there was some concern as to the condition the contractor may leave the property. The committee had a number of comments regarding subsection E and F. A number of members felt that subsection E should be scaled back and subsection F should have the owner take responsibility of the property once the contractor has moved from the site. Doug requested the various members note their ideas and send them to him.

6. General Discussion:

- a. Dale Phelan and Mark Kastl passed out a packet of material regarding HDPE to consider for several cases. Rod Ramos was scheduled to submit and sponsor the cases however, he did not attend the meeting. Dale and Mark will be providing the support for the cases.
- b. Last month, Doug Davis attended a meeting conducted by an Ad Hoc Committee under the direction of the Sub-Committee for the use of Seals at the Arizona State Board of Technical Registration (ASBTR). The committee discussed the responsible person for the use of the Specification and Details and the Agency's amendments. When an Engineer, Architect, etc. uses the documents, will that person be responsible for the correctness of the specifications and/or details? The ASBTR has ruled in the past that the registrant has that responsibility. The ASBTR code states that a registrant can only seal the specifications written or details designed under their direction. The MAG Specification and Details were not developed under his direction. Also, the code states that the registrant must comply with the various codes, regulation, laws, etc. Most of the Agencies have referenced the Specification, Details and Amendments with their local ordinances.

In turn, this obligates the registrant to be responsible for the documents they did not develop. The committee will address the issue with a policy statement. The statement will require the person to comply with the local ordinances but not make him responsible for the documents since that person did not develop them. The next meeting for the Ad Hoc Committee will be on Wednesday, June 12, 2002 at 9:00 a.m. in the offices of the ASBTR, 1990 E Camelback Road, Suite 410. *[Foot Note: From the stated meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee presented the Policy Statement to the ASBTR. On Friday, June 14, 2002, the ASBTR approved the Statement. (See attached)]*

- c. The MAG office received an e-mail from Hubbard Engineering informing them that the Swanson Gate in Detail 503 - Irrigation Standpipe is no longer being manufactured. Doug Davis responded to the e-mail. Several years ago, Doug was notified of this situation, he requested product literature, shop drawings, etc. of an equal product. No gate manufacturer responded. If any member has any information of an equal, they can submit it to the committee for review and approval. Even though the gate is not manufactured, it does not mean that it can not be used as a standard. However, if an equal can be found, the committee should consider the change.
- d. John Ashley of Arizona Cement Association addressed the committee regarding the use of truncated domes for warning devices in curb ramps. He wanted to know what the committee has done with the devices and how will they address the change? Approximately, ten years ago, the domes were suspended by the Department of Justice and parallel grooves were used. Now after 10 years, the suspension has expired and the truncated domes have now become law. Once the committee has reviewed available studies, considered all of the information available on the domes, etc., the committee will be changing the curb ramps to comply with the Federal laws.
- e. Pat Thurman asked if the members had heard of any changes to the curb landings (Details 232 & 234) regarding ADA Standards. None of the members responded. Doug Davis noted in past years, he had been informed several times of deficiencies in the ramps. In each case, the person could not provide the documentation showing the deficiencies. In his own research, he could not locate any deficiencies. ADA addresses landings for buildings however, no reference has been developed for curb ramps in street or public works applications. If any changes can be produced, the committee would consider changing the present Details.
- f. Paul Ward informed the committee that he is continuing working on having the Specification and Details certified by ADOT for the agencies that use the Specifications and Details on federally funded projects.
- g. Pat Thurman asked if any of the agencies use slotted drains and how they perform. Doug Davis stated that Mesa has used the drains for several years. They are used in conjunction with a catch basin. The drains work very well however, they have some problems with cleaning them. Since the advent of vacuum trucks, the cleaning is easier.
- h. The next meeting will be July 3, 2002 at 1:30 p.m.

7. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:41 p.m.